

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,767	SHINDO, YUICHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark L. Shevin	1793	

All Participants:

(1) Mark L. Shevin.

(2) William Bak.

Date of Interview: 21 February 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

All pending (1-25)

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Mark L. Shevin/

Status of Application: Pending first action

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:10 pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I called Mr. Bak at 9:40 am on February 19th, 2008 to describe the following restriction requirement:

Group I, claims 1-2, drawn to a sputtering target or thin film formed therefrom.

Group II, claims 3-25, drawn to a method of manufacturing high purity hafnium.

Mr. Bak called back at 1:10 pm on February 21st to provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-2. .